

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME VII

MAY 1912

NUMBER 8

Editorial

THE NEW ENGLAND ASSOCIATION

The seventh annual meeting of the Classical Association of New England was made noteworthy by the presence of Professor Gilbert Murray of Oxford University. Professor Murray's address on "*The Traditio*, or How Ancient Literature Has Been Preserved," was a striking example of fine scholarship enlivened by the historic imagination. The brilliant play of wit between the president of the association, Dr. William Gallagher, and the English scholar, was a fitting introduction to a delightful evening. Professor Murray's cordial acceptance of the fellowship of the association brought the members into warm personal relation with him. He is making the classical scholars of New England his debtors, not only by his fraternal help at this meeting, but by his Lowell Lectures in Boston and his lectures and class inspection at Amherst College.

The meeting of the New England Classical Association was made socially delightful by the generous hospitality of the members of the classical faculty of Yale University. The program showed a wise balance of pedagogical discussions, serious studies on subjects of general interest, and bright papers in a witty vein. Professor Edward Capps of Princeton was a welcome guest, representing the Classical Association of the Atlantic States.

C. D. A.

AT CINCINNATI

The eighth annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South was held on April 12 and 13 with the University of Cincinnati as host. Every arrangement was made by

the local committee of entertainment for the comfort and pleasure of the visitors, and all agreed that the good fellowship which the occasion afforded was no small portion of the values of the annual meeting. The program, with some modifications, was carried out as published in the *Journal* for March. The four papers covering the entire field of classical comedy formed a very satisfactory feature of the program, giving a distinct literary flavor which is sometimes wanting in our annual programs. The three papers presented at the popular session of Friday night by Professors Shorey, Slaughter, and Showerman were much appreciated by those who heard them. But probably the most notable feature of the formal program was that contributed by Miss Sabin, "A Concrete Illustration in Answer to the Question: 'What's the Use of Latin?'" Miss Sabin had transferred from her own classical rooms in the Oak Park High School to the walls of the assembly hall at Cincinnati the whole body of material which she exhibited in Oak Park last winter. She explained this material, how it was collected, how it could be used, and what was its bearing upon education in the classics. A brief presentation of the subject is given in the present number of the *Journal*, and in the fall a fuller account is promised. Miss Sabin's material has been exhibited during the past two weeks in the three high schools of Cincinnati.

FOREIGN-LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE A.B. DEGREE

BY ELLSWORTH D. WRIGHT
Lawrence College

Thirty or forty years ago the A.B. degree had a well-defined significance that was practically universal. But since Charles Francis Adams delivered his historic address in Sanders Theater, June 28, 1883, there has been a great deal of experimenting with the college courses, until at present many are in doubt as to just what the venerable A.B. stands for, if indeed it has any characteristic import at all. Because of this uncertainty of meaning an attempt has been made to ascertain the foreign-language requirements for the A.B. degree now in force in various representative institutions of the United States and Canada. In all sections of the country statistics have been gathered from higher schools of learning of every description, except the technical schools and the colleges for women, which for obvious reasons are excluded.

The investigation was undertaken with the simple desire to learn the facts and without previous knowledge of the practice of specific schools which might have had an influence upon the question as to whether those particular schools should be included in the list or not. The names of many other reputable institutions would appear, if response had been made to the questionnaire or to the request for a catalogue. Although great care has been exercised to secure accuracy and most of the statistics have been verified by a committee of three, we cannot hope that all errors have been avoided. We feel confident, however, that any errors that may exist in the tables are of minor importance and will not affect the results to any appreciable degree.

The unit of the tables that follow is a year of language-study irrespective of the number of class exercises per week. By "foreign language" is meant any language other than English. It is the *minimum* requirement that is reported; the emphasis here belongs

to the word minimum. For example, a certain university requires ordinarily six years or more of foreign language for the A.B. degree, but in special cases grants the degree for four years of such work to the student who enters without any foreign-language preparation whatever. In such case the entry made in the tables is four years, for this is the minimum that is sought.

The first five columns of Tables I, II, and III include all foreign

TABLE I
MINIMUM FOREIGN-LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR A.B. IN STATE UNIVERSITIES

	YEARS LANGUAGE FOR A.B.		TOTAL YEARS FOR A.B.	YEARS LANGUAGE FOR B.S.		YEARS ANCIENT LANGUAGES REQUIRED FOR A.B.	
	Preparatory	In College		Preparatory	In College	Years Preparatory	Years in College
Alabama.....	5	4	9	2	2	3 Lat.	2 Lat.
Arkansas.....	3	2	5	0	4	0	0
California.....	4	3	7	4	1	4 Lat.	1 Lat. and 2 Gr.
Colorado.....	4	0	4	0	0
Florida.....	3	4	7	0	2	3 Lat.	2 Lat.
Georgia.....	5	6	11	2	4	3 Lat.	2 Lat.
Idaho.....	6	3	9	4	2	4 Lat.	0
Illinois.....	0	2	2	0	0
Indiana.....	3	2	5	0	0
Iowa.....	2	3	5	0	0
Kansas.....	3	0	3	0	0
Maine.....	0	2	2	0	0
Michigan.....	2	0	2	0	0
Minnesota.....	0	0	0	0	0
Missouri.....	2	2	4	0	1 Lat. or 1 Gr.
Montana.....	0	2	2	0	2	0	0
Nebraska.....	3	1	4	3	1	2 Lat.	0
Nevada.....	2	2	4	2 Lat. or 2 Gr.	2 Lat. or 2 Gr.
New Mexico...	2	2	4	0	0
North Carolina	6	4	10	0	0
North Dakota..	2	2	4	0	0
Ohio Univ.....	5	4	9	5	3	4 Lat. and 1 Gr.	4 Anc. Lang.
Ohio State Univ.	4	2	6	0	0
Oklahoma.....	2	1	3	0	0
Pennsylvania							
State Coll....	6	2	8	4 Lat.	0
Tennessee.....	4	4	8	4	2	4 Lat.	4 Anc. Lang.
Texas.....	3	2	5	0	0
Vermont.....	7	2	9	2	2	4 Lat. and 3 Gr.	1 Lat. and 1 Gr.
Virginia.....	4	3	7	4	2	4 Lat. and 2 Gr.	2 Lat. or 1 Gr.
Washington.....	2	3	5	0	0
West Virginia..	2	2½	4½	2 Lat.	2½ Lat.
Wisconsin.....	0	4	4	0	0
Wyoming.....	2	0	2	0	0

languages on an equality; the last two differentiate the ancient languages from the modern. The symbol "o" signifies that there is no requirement. Although statistics are given for the B.S. degree (columns 4 and 5), this is only incidental to the main investigation. A blank space in the B.S. columns indicates that the

TABLE II

MINIMUM FOREIGN-LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR A.B. IN PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES

	YEARS LANGUAGE FOR A.B.		TOTAL YEARS FOR A.B.	YEARS LANGUAGE FOR B.S.		YEARS ANCIENT LANGUAGES REQUIRED FOR A.B.	
	Preparatory	In College		Preparatory	In College	Years Preparatory	Years in College
Leland Stanford	o	o	o	o	o
Denver, Colo...	4	1	5	o	o
Yale, Conn.....	7	o	7	4 Lat.	o
Wesleyan.....	6	2	8	2	2	4 Lat. or 3 Gr.	1 Lat. or 1 Gr.
Atlanta, Ga....	5	5	10	4 Lat. and 1 Gr.	1 Lat. and 2 Gr.
Chicago, Ill....	7	3½	10½	3	1½	4 Lat. and 3 Gr.	1 Lat. and 1 Gr.
Northwestern...	4	3	7	4	2	o	1 Lat. or 1 Gr.
De Pauw, Ind...	3	2	5	o	o
Johns Hopkins, Md.....	8	2	10	4 Lat.	2 Lat.
Boston, Mass...	5	2	7	4	1	4 Lat.	1 Lat.
Harvard.....	4	1	5	3	1	3 Lat. or 2 Gr.	o
Washington, Mo.....	5	2	7	o	o
Princeton, N.J..	9	4	13	4	2	4 Lat. and 3 Gr.	1½ Lat. and 1½ Gr.
College of New York.....	5	8	13	5	1	o	1 Lat.
Columbia.....	4	3	7	1	2	4 Lat.	1 Lat. or 1 Gr.
Cornell Univ...	5	1	6	o	o
New York Univ.	5	4	9	4	3	4 Lat. or 3 Gr.	1 Lat. or 1 Gr.
Rochester.....	6	2	8	4	½	4 Lat. or 3 Gr.	1 Lat. or 1 Gr.
Syracuse.....	7	5	12	3	2	4 Lat. and 3 Gr.	2 Lat. and 2 Gr.
Cincinnati, Ohio	3	6	9	o	o
Ohio Wesleyan.	6	2	8	6	2	3 Lat. or 3 Gr.	1 Lat. or 1 Gr.
Western Reserve.....	4	2	6	2 Lat.	o
Wooster.....	6	3	9	4	3	4 Lat. and 2 Gr.	1 Lat. and 2 Gr.
Univ. of Penn...	7	2	9	4	2	4 Lat. and 3 Gr.	1 Lat. and 1 Gr.
Univ. of South, Tenn.....	4	3	7	4 Lat.	2 Lat. or 2 Gr.
Vanderbilt.....	7	6	13	4	3	4 Lat. and 3 Gr.	2 Lat. and 2 Gr.
Canadian:							
Dalhousie...	5	5	10	3	2	3 Lat.	3 Lat.
McGill.....	4	3	7	2	1	3 Anc. Lang.	2 Anc. Lang.
Manitoba.....	4	3	7	3 Lat.	2 Lat.
Queen's.....	4	2	6	4	o	3 Lat.	1 Lat.
Toronto.....	5	6	11	3 Lat.	2 Lat.

TABLE III

MINIMUM FOREIGN-LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR A.B. IN COLLEGES

	YEARS LANGUAGE FOR A.B.		TOTAL YEARS FOR A.B.	YEARS LANGUAGE FOR B.S.		YEARS ANCIENT LANGUAGES REQUIRED FOR B.S.	
	Preparatory	In College		Preparatory	In College	Years Preparatory	Years in College
Hendrix Coll., Ark.....	5	7	12	0	0
Southern Cal. Coll. of the Pacific.....	2	2	4	2	2	0	0
Colorado Coll. Trinity Coll., Conn.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delaware Coll. Knox, Ill.	4	2	6	2 Lat.	0
Lake Forest ... McKendree.....	6	3	9	2	1	4 Lat. or 3 Gr.	1 Lat. or 1 Gr.
Earlham, Ind. ... Wabash.....	6	8	14	2	4	4 Lat.	3 Lat.
Coe, Iowa..... Cornell Coll.	3	7	10	3	5	3 Lat.	2 Lat.
Drake..... Grinnell.....	4	2	6	0	0
Iowa Wesleyan. Parsons.....	5	2	7	5	2	3 Lat. and 2 Gr.	1 Lat. and 1 Gr.
Simpson..... Upper Iowa.....	3	2	5	3	2	0	0
Baker, Kan. Kansas Wesleyan.....	3	3	6	3 Lat.	0
Washburn..... Central Univ. of Kentucky...	4	2½	6½	4	2½	4 Lat.	1 Lat. and 1½ Gr.
New Orleans, La.	6	3	9	4	2	4 Lat.	0
Tulane..... Bates, Me.	4	2	6	2	2	4 Lat.	2 Anc. Lang.
Bowdoin..... Washington Coll., Md.	4	2	6	3	2	4 Lat. or 3 Gr.	1 Lat. or 1 Gr.
Amherst, Mass. Clark.....	5	4	9	2	3	3 Lat.	1 Lat. and 2 Gr.
Tufts..... Williams.....	2	3	5	2	2	0	3 Lat. or 3 Gr.
Detroit, Mich. Olivet.....	4	2	6	2 Lat.	1 Lat.
Carleton, Minn. Hamline.....	0	5	5	0	5	0	0
Drury, Mo. William Jewell. Grand Island, Nebr.....	4	2	6	4 Anc. Lang.	1 Anc. Lang.
	5	3	8	5	3	4 Lat.	1 Lat.
	3	3	6	3	3	3 Lat.	0
	4	4	8	2	2	3 Lat.	1 Lat.
	4	2	6	4	2	4 Lat.	2 Lat.
	4	3	7	2	2	4 Lat. or 3 Gr.	1 Lat. or 1 Gr.
	6	3	9	2	1	4 Lat.	1 Lat.
	5	1	6	3 Lat.	1 Lat.
	2	5	7	0	3	2 Lat.	2 Lat.
	7	2	9	4 Lat. or 4 Gr.	2 Anc. Lang.
	0	2	2	0	0
	4	3	7	2	2	4 Lat. or 4 Gr.	1 Anc. Lang.
	7	2	9	4 Lat.	1 Lat.
	7	4	11	0	2	4 Lat. and 3 Gr.	2 Lat. and 2 Gr.
	2	3	5	2 Anc. Lang.	2 Anc. Lang.
	2	2	4	2	2	2 Lat.	0
	6	5	11	2	2	4 Lat.	1 Lat. or 3 Gr.
	3	2	5	3	2	0	0
	4	3	7	3 Lat.	3 Anc. Lang.
	2	2	4	2 Lat.	0

FOREIGN-LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS FOR A.B. DEGREE 327

TABLE III—Continued

	YEARS LANGUAGE FOR A.B.		TOTAL YEARS FOR A.B.	YEARS LANGUAGE FOR B.S.		YEARS ANCIENT LANGUAGES REQUIRED FOR A.B.	
	Preparatory	In College		Preparatory	In College	Years Preparatory	Years in College
Nebraska Wesleyan.....	3	1	4	3	1	2 Lat.	0
Dartmouth, N.H.....	6	3	9	2	2	4 Lat.	1 Lat.
Rutgers, N.J. ...	7	3	10	3	2	4 Lat. and 3 Gr.	1 Lat. and 1 Gr.
Adelphi, N.Y....	3	1	4	..	0	0	0
Alfred.....	7	2	9	2	2	4 Lat.	1 Lat.
Colgate.....	6	1½	7½	4	1	4 Lat. or 3 Gr.	½ Lat.
Hamilton.....	7	5½	12½	7	3½	4 Lat. and 3 Gr.	1½ Lat. and 1½ Gr.
Hobart.....	6	6	12	4	4	4 Lat.	2 Anc. Lang.
St. Lawrence Univ.....	7	4	11	2	2	4 Lat. and 3 Gr.	1 Lat. and 1 Gr.
Union.....	7	4	11	2	3	4 Lat. and 3 Gr.	2 Lat. and 2 Gr.
Davidson, N.C.	5	4	9	0	4	3 Lat. and 2 Gr.	2 Lat. and 2 Gr.
Trinity Coll....	2	3	5	..	0	0	0
Denison, Ohio...	6	5	11	4	1	4 Lat. and 2 Gr.	2 Lat. and 2 Gr.
Kenyon.....	6	2	8	3	2	4 Lat.	1 Lat. or 1 Gr.
Marietta.....	4	2	6	2 Lat.	0
Miami.....	4	2	6	0	0
Oberlin.....	4	1	5	2 Anc. Lang.	0
Henry Kendall, Okla.....	4	5	9	4	2	4 Lat.	2 Lat. and 3 Gr.
Allegheny, Pa..	4	2	6	4	2	2 Lat.	0
Dickinson.....	6	2	8	4	4	4 Lat. and 2 Gr.	1 Lat. and 1 Gr.
Franklin and Marshall....	6	9	15	6	7	4 Lat. and 2 Gr.	3 Lat. and 2 Gr.
Lafayette.....	6½	5	11½	4	2	4 Lat. and 2½ Gr.	2 Lat. and 2 Gr.
Lehigh.....	6	4	10	2	3	4 Lat.	1 Lat.
Pennsylvania Coll.....	6	8	14	4	6	4 Lat. and 3 Gr.	1 Lat. and 1 Gr.
Pittsburgh.....	4	2	6	2	2	4 Lat.	0
Susquehanna...	7	4	11	3	2	3 Lat. and 3 Gr.	4 Lat. and 2 Gr.
Swarthmore...	4	2	6	0	0
Ursinus.....	6	3	9	4	4	4 Lat.	2 Lat.
Washington and Jefferson....	6	3	9	4	2	4 Lat.	2 Anc. Lang.
Clafin, S.C....	4	3	7	2	2	4 Lat.	3 Lat.
Wesleyan, S.D..	5	2	7	4	1	4 Lat. and 1 Gr.	1 Lat. and 2 Gr.
Yankton.....	3	1	4	2 Lat.	0
Chattanooga, Tenn.....	7	4	11	4	4	4 Lat.	0
Fisk.....	4	0	4	4 Lat.	0
Nashville.....	4	1	5	0	0
Baylor, Tex....	3	3	6	0	0
Fort Worth....	6	4	10	2	2	4 Lat. and 2 Gr.	2 Lat. and 2 Gr.
Trinity Univ....	3	4	7	3	3	0	0
Middlebury, Vt.	6	7	13	2	5	4 Lat.	1 Lat.

TABLE III—Continued

	YEARS LANGUAGE FOR A.B.		TOTAL YEARS FOR A.B.	YEARS LANGUAGE FOR B.S.		YEARS ANCIENT LANGUAGES REQUIRED FOR A.B.	
	Preparatory	In College		Preparatory	In College	Years Preparatory	Years in College
Randolph-							
Macon, Va...	6	3	9	4 Lat.	1 Lat.
Richmond.....	3	5	8	2	3	3 Lat.	1 Lat. or 1 Gr.
Washington and Lee.....	4	2	6	4	2	0	0
William and Mary.....	3	4	7	2	2	3 Lat.	2 Lat.
Whitman, Wash.	4	2	6	4	1	4 Lat. or 3 Gr.	1 Anc. Lang.
Bethany, W.Va.	6	4	10	6	4	4 Lat. and 2 Gr.	2 Gr.
Wesleyan.....	6	2	8	2	2	4 Lat. and 2 Gr.	1 Lat. and 1 Gr.
Beloit, Wis....	2	4	6	2	4	0	0
Carroll.....	2	3	5	2	2	0	0
Lawrence.....	0	3	3	0	0
Milton.....	4	2	6	2 Lat.	0
Ripon.....	2	3	5	0	0

degree of B.S. is not granted, i.e., that that particular institution grants only the A.B. to graduates of its college of liberal arts. It should be noted that it is only the college of liberal arts that is taken into consideration, all other colleges of the university being ignored in the report. The names are given in alphabetical order by states.

Table IV gives a summary of the items of the first three tables. The most striking single fact as to the language requirements for the A.B. degree is the utter lack of uniformity—the range of divergence being from zero to fifteen years.

There are 155 institutions listed—33 state universities, 31 private universities and 91 colleges. At one school of each of the three groups students may procure the A.B. without any knowledge of any foreign language, viz., at the University of Minnesota, at Leland Stanford Junior, and at the College of the Pacific.

A glance at the column of state universities reveals the fact that 17 of the 33 have a minimum foreign-language requirement of 5 years or more, while 16 require less than 5 years; that is, the average is about 5 years.

Of the private universities, 16 require 8 years or more, which means that 8 years is about the average of this group. In the case of the colleges the average is about 7 years, for 50 of the 91 in this group require 7 years or more, leaving but 41 that require less than 7 years.

From the column of totals it is learned that 85 require 7 years or more, and that 70 require less than 7 years. That is, for the schools listed the average minimum foreign-language requirement for the A.B. degree is about 7 years.

TABLE IV

Years Foreign Language Required for A.B.	No. State Universities	No. Private Universities	No. Colleges	Total Institutions
0.....	1	1	1	3
1.....
2.....	5	..	1	6
3.....	2	..	1	3
4.....	8	..	7	15
5.....	5	3	10	18
6.....	1	3	21	25
7.....	3	8	10	21
8.....	2	3	5	10
9.....	4	4	13	21
10.....	1	4	5	10
11.....	1	1	9	11
12.....	..	1	3	4
13.....	..	3	2	5
14.....	2	2
15.....	1	1
Total.....	33	31	91	155

The further observation may be made that of the 155 schools only 27 require less than 5 years for the A.B., while 128 require 5 years or more. More than half of the 27 are state universities. If the state universities are barred from the reckoning, only 11 institutions out of 122 grant the A.B. for less than 5 years of foreign-language study, and seven of these are in the 4-year group. The 11 that require less than 5 years are: Adelphi, Carleton, Collegiate Department of Clark, Fisk, Grand Island, Lawrence College, Leland Stanford Junior, Nebraska Wesleyan, College of the Pacific, University of Southern California, and Yankton.

Thus far the investigation has treated all languages as one homogeneous group in accord with the fallacious idea of the equivalence of studies. The three tables that follow differentiate the ancient classics and show among other things that five institutions out of every seven do not regard all languages as on a par.

TABLE V*
REQUIREMENTS IN GREEK

No. Years Greek	No. State Universities	No. Private Universities	No. Colleges	Total Schools
1.....	1	..	1	2
2.....	2	..	1	3
3.....	..	1	5	6
4.....	1	4	10	15
5.....	..	2	3	5
Total.....	4	7	20	31

* Fractional parts of a year are ignored in this table.

Table V shows that 31 schools have an absolute requirement in Greek—precisely one school in every five. The amount varies from one year to five. Only 4 state universities are in the category: Vermont in the East, California in the West, Ohio between, and Virginia in the South. In each of these 31 institutions Latin is also required—Greek is never required to the exclusion of Latin. While only 31 schools have an absolute requirement in Greek, in 31 other institutions a choice is allowed in whole or in part between Greek and Latin, the rule reading, “Latin or Greek,” or “ancient languages.”

This neglect of Greek is deplored by many, if not the majority, of broad-minded educators. For the truth of this statement one might cite the action of the Cornell professors who signed the following declaration:¹ “We, the undersigned professors (or one-time professors) of Cornell University, should prefer as students of our respective subjects those who have included both Greek and Latin among their preparatory studies in the high school rather than those who have neglected these studies in favor of modern languages or of our own respective subjects.” The signers were

¹ See *Educational Review*, XLII, No. 1, (June, 1911), 106 ff.

professors of Romance languages, zoölogy, history, German, English, mechanical engineering, oratory, mathematics, philosophy, entomology, electrical engineering, civil engineering, drawing and painting, economics and statistics, architecture, histology and embryology, physiology, and biochemistry. Doubtless in any enlightened faculty in the land the above action could be duplicated. For there is abundant ground for the assertion of an experienced teacher of English: "Equipment for liberal scholarship of any kind depends upon a knowledge of the classics. No better training in logical processes was ever devised than the philological discipline of the classics. No discipline more thoroughly systematized, more uniform, more definite, more rigorous. No better training in the use of one's own language than translation from the classics. No better school of poetry or of oratory than the classics. No better gallery of lives—which to contemplate is to know that virtue is its own reward and vice its own penalty. To the abandonment of the classics with their sweet simplicity and their majesty, their orderly restraint and their severe regard, I attribute in no small degree the declining ability to think clearly, to speak and write lucidly, precisely, effectively, the declining love of noble letters and noble art—the declining respect for tradition and authority, for the heritage and the faith—the declining splendor of the ideal."

There are 110 institutions that have a requirement in the ancient classics. Table VI shows the minimum requirement without differentiating between the Latin and the Greek. It presents the case of Latin *par excellence*, although the reservation should be made that 17 institutions in the list allow a free choice between Latin and Greek; but in all except the 17 Latin must be offered in whole or in part and may be of course in the 17. Greek is not required to the exclusion of Latin, as stated above.

The ratio of 110:155 is nearly equivalent to the ratio 5:7, i.e., 5 of every 7 schools have a classical-language requirement. This classical requirement averages 5 years. For in the column of totals the 5-year group stands midway between extremes, having 43 names below it and 45 above it.

Over half of the state universities have no classical requirement—

19 of the 33, as shown by Table VII. In the case of the private universities and colleges the ratio is nearly 4 to 1 in favor of a classical requirement, that is, if the state institutions are eliminated from the reckoning, it may be said of the other schools that 4 out of every 5 have a requirement in the ancient languages for the A.B. degree.

TABLE VI
ANCIENT LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS IN THE 110 INSTITUTIONS

No. Years Latin (or Greek, or Both)	No. State Universities	No. Private Universities	No. Colleges	Total Schools
1.....	1	2	..	3
2.....	1	2	7	10
3.....	7	7
4.....	4	6	13	23
5.....	3	5	14	22
6.....	..	3	10	13
7.....	2	..	3	5
8.....	1	1	4	6
9.....	2	3	6	11
10.....	..	1	3	4
11.....	..	2	3	5
12.....	1	1
Total.....	14	25	71	110

As to the number of degrees offered, the state universities again are in a class by themselves, as the majority of them prefer the single degree, while the other schools as a group are in favor of a plurality of degrees in the ratio of 82:40, or more than two to one. The totals are 95 and 60, the ratio being somewhat less than two to one in favor of the plurality of degrees.

There is a connection between the adoption of the one-degree scheme and the abandonment of ancient-language requirements. According to Table VII only 19 state universities in the list require no classical language; 17 of these grant one degree only. There are but 20 state universities that grant the A.B. only; 17 of these have no classical requirement. Again, three-fourths of all the schools of the list that have no classical-language requirement offer the one degree only, that is, 34 of the 45 of Table VII. These statistics indicate that the introduction of the one-degree schedule is attended for the most part by the abandonment of all ancient-language

requirements. Apart from the testimony of statistics, a priori reasoning leads to the same conclusion. If only one degree is offered the standard is quite naturally suited to the desires and the capacity of those who are most averse to the study of the languages. To make one common level easily accessible to all necessitates that the heights be lowered. If, however, the peaks are permitted to remain and the youth are summoned thither, there will be found those who are capable of scaling the heights, for all are not created equal in mental gifts and aptitudes. But to abolish distinctions

TABLE VII

Totals	Grant A.B. Only	Two Degrees or More		Require No Latin or Greek	Require Latin or Greek	Totals
33	20	13State Universities.....	19	14	33
31	13	18Private Universities.....	6	25	31
91	27	64Colleges.....	20	71	91
155	60	95Totals.....	45	110	155

is to destroy incentive and spur and to deprive the republic and the literary world of much-needed leadership. Advocates of the one-degree plan posit the premise that all studies are equal and that everything depends on a student's attitude toward his work. If he gives himself with whole-hearted enthusiasm to his subject, one study is as good as another, they claim. There is much truth in this contention—enough to deceive the very elect in many cases. For it does make a very great difference in results as to how a student relates himself to his work. But this is not the whole truth. Their premise is false and so is their conclusion. There is a difference in studies. No two studies, in fact, show an exact equivalence, either in informational value or in disciplinary effect.

Of the 60 institutions that grant the single degree nearly 30 have changed to the one-degree plan since 1899, the rate of change being less than 3 per year. Of these 30 about 15 made the change since the year 1904, which indicates that the rate of change is not

increasing. In corresponding with the schools no questions were asked about the desirability of the one-degree plan or about the probability of its adoption in the future, but in several instances opinions were volunteered. Three remarked that they expected to try the one-degree experiment; there were many expressions of opposite tenor, as, "we do not think of changing to the one-degree"; "we entirely object to giving A.B. with no Greek"; "until present year A.B. only, now B.S. for those who want college training, but not the training the A.B. stands for"; "I believe our faculty is well intrenched in the view that degrees should be granted in such a way as to give some fair indication of the character of work done for them." From a one-degree college came this: "we plan to offer B.S. also, but not yet approved by trustees"; from another of the same class, "the one-degree plan is not the unqualified success which its supporters had hoped to realize."

The one-degree plan is alluring and easy to make; it is simple and has the democratic, or rather socialistic, air. The testimony of experience, however, is the one that carries weight; also, be it noted, it is many times harder to return to the plurality of degrees, thereby confessing to an error. There are some noteworthy instances of a movement from the one degree back to a plurality of degrees. The University of Nebraska tried the A.B. only until 1909, but since, has been granting the B.S. also; the University of Virginia gave the A.B. only for about 15 years, now gives the A.B. and the B.S.; Middlebury tried the single degree during the years 1903-8, now gives A.B. and B.S.; Drury College put in B.S. in 1911; Cornell University has been trying the one-degree plan but introduced the B.Chem. in 1911 and added one year to her language requirement for the A.B. degree; Harvard, champion of the elective system, gave up the one-degree plan in 1906 and since then has been granting the A.B. and B.S.; in 1905 Columbia made the same change from A.B. only to the A.B. and B.S.

Although the adoption of the one-degree plan is often followed sooner or later by a surrender of all requirements in the ancient languages, nevertheless 25 of the institutions which grant A.B. only require some Latin, the amount varying from one to six years; one of them requires five years of Latin and three years of

Greek. In none other of the 25 is Greek a requirement, although in five cases it may be substituted in whole or in part for the Latin. As these 25 colleges grant the one degree only it follows that they require every student to take Latin. Many would claim that this is an unwarranted hardship. But the defender of the vogue comes forward with: "Why shouldn't every student take Latin? Whatever his lot in life he will need to know English, and to be able to think," referring to the close dependence of English upon Latin and to the dictum that the study of Latin promotes logical thinking.

To recapitulate: The testimony of 155 of the most reputable representative schools, chosen at random, is to the following effect: The average minimum foreign language requirement for the A.B. degree is 7 years. Only 1 school in 5 requires Greek for A.B., the amount averaging between 3 and 4 years. There is a classical language requirement (mostly Latin) in 5 schools of every 7, and the average amount is 5 years. The majority of schools, nearly two-thirds, offer more degrees than one. Three-fourths of the schools that require no Latin or Greek offer one degree only—that is, the one-degree plan and the no-ancient-language schedule are often concomitant. The tables would yield figures much more favorable to the classics, were it not that so many state universities are included in the report. It would seem that the tax-supported institution feels under some obligation to decorate the sons and daughters of taxpayers with the A.B. and to do this on very easy terms. Of course there are exceptions, but the class is here considered as a whole.

One observes also that if only one degree is to be offered, it is always the A.B. that is desired, and this too, although a student may give his chief attention to science, and although he may avoid language-study altogether as at Leland Stanford Junior or the University of Minnesota. Why is this? Why do they take the degree that signifies a classical education? Why not choose a Ph.B., or the B.L., or invent a new title? Their choice is a confession of the esteem they have in their secret hearts for that for which the A.B. stands; and their belief is corroborated by facts—facts like the following, for example. Elaborate investigation has been made in three different quarters under different auspices as to

the relation of studies to success in life. President Lowell took the statistics of twenty college classes and the facts were in favor of the classics. Again, at Bowdoin an independent line of research led to the same conclusion. Last of all, President Foster, adopting a different definition of success, made a scientific study of the problem and with the same result. In referring to the concurrent testimony of the three lines of investigation he says: "It is certainly notable that in such extensive and independent studies, the most successful groups of men in college, in professional schools, and in later life, invariably spent more time on the classics than the less successful or random selection of students."

As the tables give only *minimum requirements*, they reveal but a partial view of the present status of language-study—both of languages as a whole and of the classics in particular. For example, of some of the colleges that are listed as having no ancient language requirements the statement is made by our correspondents "most students offer Latin." In fact, there are some signs that the pendulum has begun to swing forward once more. In evidence is the Amherst idea, the stout stand in maintaining a classical requirement recently taken by Harvard, the appeals made by far-sighted leaders from the platform and in the press on behalf of the classics and the return of influential colleges to plurality of degrees after trying the one-degree plan. President Buckham prophesies that ten years hence many more institutions will require Greek for the A.B.

For generations past the A.B. has stood for an education that included a training in the ancient classics, and it stands for that today in a large majority of the schools, as the tables demonstrate. The discipline of the ancient classics is distinctive, unique; there may be another discipline that is similar, but as a distinguished scientist remarked, nothing else is just it. Is it fair or honorable to label with an A.B. that which is devoid of the classical element?

Is there any good, logical reason why a college should give the A.B. for work that does not include the old humanistic course that trains for leadership in thought and action? For other lines of work there are labels at hand a-plenty, and still others may be invented. Charles Francis Adams, after his Sanders Theater pronouncement had been tried for twenty-three years, frankly

recants in these words: "I would prescribe one of the classic tongues as a compulsory study to the day of graduation, the one royal road to a knowledge of all that is finest in letters and in art." Mr. Adams evidently means every student of whatever course. Let us suggest by way of compromise that this ideal plan be restricted in its application to students of a single course, namely, the A.B. course. Let the minimum requirement for the A.B. degree be 7 years of foreign language, the average shown by the tables, and let about half of this be in the ancient classics. In the light of the past history of the A.B. and of the present facts the suggestion seems a reasonable one; its general adoption would work injustice to no one and the gain would be more than that of uniformity.

CO-ORDINATION OF LATIN WITH THE OTHER SUBJECTS OF THE HIGH-SCHOOL CURRICULUM¹

BY MASON D. GRAY
East High School, Rochester, N.Y.

In the preceding paper I discussed the evils arising from the isolation of the high-school subjects and pointed out in general the methods we had employed to correct them. In no field are the evils of the *compartamental* departmental system more conspicuous than in the languages. In grammar, in vocabulary, in subject-matter, each language pursues its own course with but slight and sporadic efforts either to make definite use of what the pupil has done elsewhere or to teach new material in such a way as to make it of definite service elsewhere than in the particular language.

This paper will deal with the co-ordination of the languages in syntax. The problem has two distinct sides: first, the distribution of responsibility for definite grammar work among the various departments throughout the four years, and second, the adoption of an identical terminology.

It is the first of these problems which has claimed our special attention. Our ideal has been both to stop the waste attendant upon repeated presentation of old principles in new guises, to insist that each successive language class should build consciously upon its predecessor, and thus to create in the mind of the pupil an organic language unity. This ideal has required the organization of the grammatical territory, the assignment to each year of English, Latin, German, etc., of a definite range of topics, and the equipment of each successive language teacher with the necessary material upon which to build. We have made gratifying progress toward that ideal, but much still remains to be done.

The adoption of a common terminology has been a secondary consideration, but a natural outgrowth of the first. Our first

¹ This paper has been written with the co-operation of Mr. Ernest R. Clark, of the Department of English, and Mr. William Betz, of the Department of Modern Languages. They are to be held responsible only for the facts of co-ordination described, not for the accompanying discussion.

efforts toward co-ordination about seven years ago were, in fact, directed toward the reform of terminology, but we made little progress because agreement here was impossible until agreement had been reached in more fundamental matters. Each effort to get together met an almost impregnable obstacle in a traditional and deeply ingrained attitude, shared by all of us and no less fatal because entirely sincere, that expressed itself more or less unconsciously in such tangible expressions as "Yes, but after all Latin is Latin, and English is English." "The genius of German is different from that of English," "You can't force English into a Latin groove," or "English is a grammarless tongue," etc. So completely has the tangible presence of widely differing terminologies obscured the underlying identity of ideas, even among those who undertake to write our textbooks. It became obvious that we must go back a step farther and reach a common basis where these divergencies in point of view could be reconciled.

This handicap did not prevent the several languages from attempting within obviously identical areas to co-ordinate their work. A very considerable proportion of the principles covered in the first year are clearly identical and our first step was to agree upon certain of these to be covered in the first few weeks in English and to be carried over bodily into Latin and German. To emphasize the idea of co-ordination, for two years the experiment was tried of giving the same teacher the same pupils in Latin and English. Administrative difficulties made the consistent carrying-out of this plan impossible, but the idea was given equal prominence by other means.

From these very modest beginnings there has gradually developed an inter-departmental solidarity and responsibility which may be defined tangibly thus:

All language teachers should present or review each grammatical topic in such a way that it shall, deliberately and consciously, by teacher and by pupil, be made to its fullest extent immediately valid for every other language the pupils are likely to study in high school, and in such a way also that it shall put the pupils into an attitude of anticipated familiarity with the same element in any new language.¹

¹ This applies naturally only to conscious grammar work. It does not apply to such limited use of direct perception as seems desirable in first-year Latin nor to the wider application of the same principle in the teaching of modern languages.

The acceptance of this platform has been gradual. For teachers to agree to treat the relative pronoun from this universal point of view was not difficult, but to agree in the treatment of the possessive adjective was a different matter. The idea of indirect object lends itself readily to universal application, but the tenses offered far greater difficulties. To treat the subject and object as valid for other languages requires no very great step, but to agree upon a similar treatment of the subjunctive requires the development of a larger vision.

Progress has been in direct ratio to the efforts made to put our convictions into practice. When we have definitely sought to teach any grammatical area with the other languages consciously in mind, our horizon expands and we begin to examine with a broader view phenomena the identity of which we have never before suspected. There develops ultimately the practical working maxim of seeking the solution of a difficult problem in the vernacular by opening the Latin and modern-language grammars. In this conception our original divergencies in point of view have been reconciled and the gradual adoption of a common terminology has followed almost automatically.¹

¹ It may be asked to what extent each principle is universally valid. This is the vital point upon which perfect co-ordination and the complete harmonization of terminology absolutely depends. But a full discussion of the question is outside the practical purpose of these papers. The answer involves the careful distinction between the grammatical *idea*, on the one hand, which is logical, which can be defined in terms of the sentence *without the use of a technical term*, and which, as the necessary complement, is therefore universal, and on the other hand the *mode of expression*, which represents the genius of the individual language. The *technical terms* developed in the various grammars to define the ideas have been determined mainly by the second consideration, and this has not only produced wide divergencies, but has obscured their real identity. To harmonize terms we must go back to this identity and make our terms fit, not the *individual* genius of a particular language, but the *universal* underlying idea. When by grammar, then, we mean thought conceptions and relations, there is as much grammar in one language as in any other, in English as in Sanskrit. It follows that practically all the grammatical principles that the pupil will ever meet in a foreign language are already entirely familiar to that pupil and have been expressed countless times in his own vernacular, that only consciousness of this knowledge is needed to make them universally applicable and even definitely anticipated in the study of a foreign language. Nowhere in the entire realm of language study, if, indeed, in any study whatever, does the principle of apperception, of proceeding from the known to the unknown, have such wide scope. From this principle of universality there must ultimately come into existence a universal grammar, to which the individual grammars in syntactical method, content, arrangement, and, terminology shall strictly conform.

The distribution of grammar work involves three considerations, the initial equipment, a review of this equipment from the point of view described above, and the subsequent grammatical development.

I. Five years ago, at the request of the departments of Latin, English, and Modern Languages of the two Rochester high schools, I drew up a syllabus containing the minimum grammatical requirements for entering pupils. This syllabus was very moderate in its demands and, while now in need of revision as a result of our own progress, has been carefully observed by the grade teachers. There has been a notable absence of that mistrust which sometimes produces an unfortunate gap between the elementary and the secondary school. No effort, however, has as yet been made to secure continuity of *method* as illustrated in the next paragraph. We have been too aware of the shortcomings of college men in their relation to high-school work not to realize that, however sound our principles are, the practical problems involved must be worked out by those actually engaged in the work. It has, however, been very interesting to note that several elementary-school teachers after visiting the high school are now seeking to adapt the method to their pupils.

II. The review of this equipment from the universal point of view is undertaken by the English department. The work begins the first day of the high-school course, and practically all the time for about two weeks and the greater portion of the time for about four or six weeks is devoted to it. The basis of the work is a series of sentences covering all the important topics of the entering syllabus and a large proportion of the topics that will arise during the first year of Latin or German. The work is presented from two clear-cut standpoints, the *logical* character of grammatical ideas and the *universality* of each principle.

1. The first purpose is attained by requiring the pupil to discard all technical terms and to devote his entire energy to the analysis of *ideas*, to state *what* the given word, phrase, or clause *tells about the rest of the sentence*. This simple question, "What does it tell?" penetrates to the very essence of the problem, isolates by its very utterance the particular form under discussion

from all the rest of the sentence, while the answer represents the *idea* purely and simply and establishes the logical relation. It constitutes a most effective tool with which to create and maintain an active grammatical consciousness. It is the sole but adequate weapon at this stage and, in fact, the most frequent grammatical question heard in any beginning class. The utmost stress is laid upon the strictest accuracy in this definition in terms of the sentence. The answer must be stripped of all unnecessary verbiage and reduced to its lowest terms, a process that will frequently lead the pupil to discover for himself the brief technical term that best defines the idea. Let me illustrate with our very first sentence.

"After the unlucky ship had been detained at sea three weeks by the accident, terra firma was a welcome sight to the impatient passengers." In "parsing" this sentence the pupil is not asked to classify technically the nouns, phrases, and clauses, but to answer simply with regard to them the question, "What does it tell?"

"Ship" tells *what* had been detained.

"At sea" tells *where* the ship had been detained.

"Three weeks" tells *how long* the ship had been detained.

"By the accident" tells *by what* (i.e., because of what) the ship had been detained.

"After the accident" tells *when* terra firma was a welcome sight.

"To passengers" tells *to whom* terra firma was a welcome sight.

"Unlucky" tells *what kind* of ship had been detained.

"Sight" tells *what* terra firma was.

Particular care is given to the use of *who*, *whose*, *whom*, in the belief that this is especially adapted to create a *feeling* for the synthetical genius of the Latin.

This may seem very simple and elementary. It is, but when pupils have great difficulty, as they do, in thus defining *precisely* in their own language the grammatical idea in terms of the sentence, is it not very obvious that a *technical term*, no matter how readily uttered, would have had no real or precise meaning back of it? And is not this last fact in turn the reason why the apparent familiarity of the pupil with a technical term is often entirely out of proportion to his capacity to apply to a given analysis the knowledge that his familiarity with the term would seem to imply? The above process is continued until a very high degree of accuracy and facility has been obtained in thus defining the concept, and

until some confidence is felt that this method has been established in the pupil's mind as a permanent habit of attack.

2. The second purpose of this preliminary grammar work, to secure the idea of universality, is accomplished by eternally enforcing it upon the pupil's mind that he is studying not *English grammar* but *grammar*, that what he is learning at a particular recitation in his English class he will find valid in the next recitation in German or Latin; that everything he covers in this preliminary work is to be taken over in a body into his foreign-language work, and that conversely every grammatical principle that he hears of in Latin or German will be equally valid in English. The point is driven home with illustrations, beginning with the simplest form of a sentence containing subject, verb, and object. Such a sentence as, "The man killed the lion," will be put on the board translated into other languages taught in high school, and the pupil brought to realize that he is analyzing once and for all the ideas contained in the English sentence for all the languages he will ever study. Upon this aspect of the work the greatest possible emphasis is laid.

The value of this work has been found to be very great from the point of view of the contemporary foreign-language class. The English work has not only covered in the *analysis of ideas* practically all the topics that arise the first term, but these analyses are very frequently in the actual form desired. Thus, the place ideas, the three time ideas, as the sentence quoted illustrated, have already received in the analysis of ideas a sufficiently correct designation for immediate use in Latin. This is true of many other constructions.¹

¹ It may be asked what has induced the English department to undertake this particular obligation, when it is frequently the case in high schools that no such co-operation would be possible. The reasons may be given briefly as follows:

1. The development of a feeling of inter-departmental responsibility and a consequent willingness to accept a definite share of the grammatical burden.
2. The conviction of the correctness of this method of approaching the high-school grammar work and the consequent realization that the particular task described above must be performed in that particular language which all the pupils take, viz., English.
3. A realization that as the present tendency to develop the extensive side of English in the grammar school has increased the foreign-language difficulties, the

While co-ordination in vocabulary is not the subject of this paper, it may be noted in passing that all of the sentences, like the one quoted, contain some Latin word or expression in common use.

When this preliminary work has been accomplished, the English teachers review the same material again with the use of technical terms, following the terminology agreed upon. In both reviews, the non-technical and the technical, the following topics are emphasized.¹

Nouns: predicate nominative after verbs *to be*, etc., and with passive verbs; possession; indirect object; direct object; direct address.

Pronouns: personal; relative; demonstrative; interrogative; declension; person.

Adjectives: possessives; degree.

Verbs: voice; time sphere; forms in *-ing*.

Adverbs: what they modify; degree.

Prepositions: what they govern.

Conjunctions: what they connect; subordinate; co-ordinate.

Clauses: independent; dependent; noun; adjective; adverb.

Phrases: adjective; adverbial; what they express.

III. In the subsequent development of the grammar work in the foreign language there is maintained, first of all, the closest continuity of method. The approach is always through an English sentence, if possible one already employed in the English class. The question "What does it tell?" is the lever with which each new grammatical problem is attacked, the means of correcting a grammatical error, the constant mode of testing a pupil's real understanding of a technical term already given. By this very tangible bond of union the pupil is prepared in advance for the identity of details that will be taken up later.

English work in the high school should assist the foreign languages to overcome the handicap.

4. The perception that it will be a decided gain to the English work itself to contribute substantially to the common fund at the beginning. For it is only in the first few weeks that much definite grammar work is placed upon the English teachers. From that point on they are the beneficiaries through the foreign-language teachers of the ideas they have established, for equally definite efforts are made by the Latin teachers in later grammar work to make it of direct and conscious application to English.

¹ Copies of our introductory papers can be secured on application.

The actual topics assigned to the first-year language work are determined by three considerations. In the first place, the demands of the succeeding text in the same language is of great, but by no means exclusive, importance. For the proposition before the writer of a first-year Latin book, for example, cannot be simply, "What grammatical principles are most common in Caesar?" but also, "What grammatical principles are most important in making Latin of service as the foundation of future foreign-language work and most important in giving pupils a grasp of their own vernacular?" In other words, it must be vitally interwoven with other subjects if it is to become of adequate *service* to the boys or girls who do not pursue Latin more than one or two years. Furthermore, it will repeatedly be found that a certain grammatical principle not absolutely demanded by either of the above considerations can be much more economically and profitably introduced in connection with some other principle with which it can be brought into immediate contrast or comparison. The group system is a very important means of clarifying related topics.

The limits of space will not permit me to publish here a complete set of grammatical topics, but I will describe in detail several particular topics which will illustrate our co-ordination.

1. *The cases*.—The English teachers, during that period of the preliminary work when they take up the technical terms, develop the terms nominative, genitive, dative, objective, vocative. This is accurate enough at that stage. The Latin here has simply to develop the accusative and ablative. The German finds the work practically done. The French follows the German. The case uses assigned to the genitive and dative in English are at the beginning those common to all languages, possession and indirect object. With these ideas assumed, but reviewed, the Latin and German begin. The other case uses of the dative and genitive are developed in Latin and reviewed in English. All accusative uses except direct object are first developed in Latin.

2. *The tenses*.—The English teachers require every pupil to give the synopsis of a weak and strong verb before the end of the *tenth* week in the following form:

	FORM	IDEA AND TENSE NAME
Past.	I praised (or did praise) ¹	= Past simple.
	I was praising	= Past progressive.
	I had praised	= Past completed.
	(I was about to praise) ²	= (Past yet to come).
Present.	I praise (or do praise)	= Present simple.
	I am praising	= Present progressive.
	I have praised	= Present completed.
	(I am about to praise)	= (Present yet to come).
Future.	I shall praise, etc.	

The emphasis in the English class is placed upon the tense idea and not upon the tense name. Here it is distinctly the classical interests that hinder a complete identification of the definition of the idea with the name of the tense. The English department stands ready to accept any set of names that is desired by the foreign languages. Why should Latin define the idea of a tense as past *completed* and name the tense past *perfect*? We are, however, in complete agreement as to the best way of defining the *idea* and that is the important thing. We are aiming also to secure an identity of tense terminology. The college-preparatory pupil is the stumbling-block, but we are rapidly approaching the point where the interests of the small minority will no longer be permitted to exercise so disproportionate an influence. The colleges must themselves meet the situation. The names of the Latin tenses should themselves be descriptive and even where this would require a double name, if thereby *idea* and *form* are both adequately designated, economy of time will result. Hence we are now discussing the advisability of adopting for the Latin, indicative tenses given in the English table above.

Exact agreement on this detail is, however, not essential to effective co-ordination between the departments. English is for-

¹ The identity in *tense* idea in these two expressions is emphasized.

² This is not emphasized, but it is taught because the pupil thereby gets a complete picture of time ideas with one simple tense in each time sphere and three relative tenses, expressing time relatively past, present, and future. We have wavered between the terms absolute and simple. The former is technically better, but the more familiar term is better at the early stage. Similarly, we have wavered between progressive, going-on, continuous, imperfect. The second is the most accurate, but is awkward. The last has become too firmly associated with past time. The objection to progressive is that it puts undue emphasis upon one aspect of the tense.

tunate in having a separate form to express each idea, but it is constantly enforced upon the pupil that he will meet all of these *ideas* in his Latin, German, Greek, and French tenses. As the various tenses of the verb are taken up in Latin this identical English conjugation is reviewed and each Latin tense explained on that basis. The entire conjugation of *laudo* is memorized in the same order. We still keep the special more or less meaningless *tense* names of perfect, imperfect, etc., but the very act of co-ordinating our work with the English has brought us to see the inadequacy of the names. The French and German teachers build upon the same foundation, beginning with a review of the same English conjugation and ideas and following gradually with *louer* and *loben*.¹ The Greek follows the same method.

3. *The moods*.—Here the Latin is the basis. In the latter part of the first year all independent and dependent subjunctives are taken up that will be of importance elsewhere. It becomes necessary to distinguish those Latin subjunctives that are subjunctive in idea, such as the ideas of wish, will, anticipation, and purpose, and which will be expected to appear in English, Greek, German, and French, and those that are apparently mechanical, such as result, relative clauses of description, *cum* clauses, and indirect questions. No work is done in the moods in English until after this stage is passed, and the modern languages are preparing to follow the Latin in this respect. Fundamental subjunctives are given identical names throughout.

4. *Relative clauses*.—This whole topic, including the use of the English *that*, *which*, *but*, etc., and the correct English punctuation, is taught in the Latin classes during the second term and carried over as a unit into the English classes. We are compelled to revise the punctuation of all our Latin texts, which exhibit a curious imitation of German methods and mark out all relative clauses. This confusing custom must hamper the work of English teachers throughout the country. There seems to be no reason why the elementary German work in the high school should not follow the English method. We are discussing the point now.

¹ This has just gone into effect this year.

5. *Pronouns*.—The entering syllabus *requires* only a knowledge of personal, relative, demonstrative, and interrogative pronouns. The possessives are added by the English and are called adjectives, on grounds discussed later. The Latin develops the distinction between intensive and reflexive and adds the indefinite. This table, with identical names, is then taken over by the Greek and modern languages.

These five topics will illustrate our procedure. We shall never reach absolute fixity. The systematic analysis of what we have done which this first formal presentation compelled has itself brought a new adjustment in certain details. The vital consideration is that teachers shall know upon what they can count. Just as the Latin department knew at the beginning of this year through definitely printed papers exactly what was to be covered by the English teachers in the first term, so they, in turn, at the close of the year will hand over to the teachers of French and German as well as those of Caesar and Greek a definite table of principles and names which can be made next September the basis of a rapid review in the new language. During the first week in Greek, for example, about two days are spent in covering systematically and in detail all the principles in Latin grammar that apply to the Greek. The pupils thus get a view of the entire field and find that they are already masters of the greater part of it.

Our co-ordination has led automatically to an interesting and valuable by-product, identity in terminology. This final stage has by no means been neglected and in a supplementary paper I shall give some of the terminology agreed upon. I shall at the same time compare our results, which represent a series of changes, adjustments, and readjustments, covering a period of several years, with the British report, recently published, which shows the results secured from a purely theoretical consideration of the subject.¹

¹ This phase is now the object of several systematic investigations in England, Germany, France, and the United States. For a full account of the literature of the subject see the discussion by Professor W. G. Hale, chairman of the American Committee of Fifteen, in the *School Review* of January, 1912.

AN EXHIBIT IN ANSWER TO THE HIGH-SCHOOL BOY'S QUESTION: "WHAT'S THE USE OF LATIN?"

BY FRANCES E. SABIN
Oak Park High School

An abstract statement never convinces; concrete illustrations often do. One of the greatest crimes against pedagogy of which the average classical teacher is guilty is that of replying to the oft-repeated question, "What's the use of Latin?" by saying: "It's good for the mind," or "It helps one in English," or "It makes French easier," etc. On the other hand a few simple illustrations in graphic form showing just how it is, for example, that the Romance languages may be learned in half the time with Latin as a basis will hold the attention of the boy and perhaps convince him of the truth of the abstract statement. It is with this well-known principle of pedagogy in mind that the Latin Department of the Oak Park High School has recently prepared an Exhibit which illustrates in a concrete form the various ways in which Latin is of real use to the practical man of today.

The material, consisting of wall maps, charts, photographs, newspaper clippings, advertisements, etc., covering a very wide range of illustrative matter, is classified and arranged on the walls of two large rooms. Exclusive of certain introductory matters regarding education in general and the various meanings of the word "practical"—that ambiguous term which has confined Latin and Greek for the average person to that mysterious and (for him) useless realm of "culture"—the Exhibit falls under the following outline:

THE RELATION OF GREEK AND LATIN TO PRACTICAL LIFE

- I. Greek and Latin make the English language more intelligible.
- II. Greek and Latin are of supreme value to the literary mastery of English.

- III. Latin is the foundation of the Romance languages.
- IV. Greek and Latin afford superior mental training.
- V. Greek and Latin are essential to an intimate acquaintance with art and decorative designs in general.
- VI. Greek and Latin explain much of our modern architecture.
- VII. Greek and Latin form the terminology of science.
- VIII. Greek and Latin contribute more or less directly to success in the professions.
- IX. Greek and Latin add vitality to textbooks of Greek and Roman history, and give a deeper insight into the two great civilizations upon which our own is based.
- X. Greek and Latin make many things in the world about us more interesting.

As many graphic devices as possible have been used in illustrating the above, the emphasis in all cases being directed to the practical side. Whenever possible the illustration has been based on the student's personal experience or connected in some way with his world. And in this alone lies the effectiveness of the Exhibit. The following detailed illustrations in connection with I and III will perhaps make clear the method which has been used throughout.¹

I. Latin makes the English language more intelligible.

<p>Latin is the key to such unusual words as these: a "veridical" story</p> <p>Latin: <i>verus</i> = true <i>dicere</i> = to say.</p>	<p>Latin makes words mean more: "carbuncle"</p> <p>Latin: <i>carbo</i> = a live coal.</p>	<p>Specimens of English prose with the Latin element underlined in red. English is very largely indebted to Latin. [Eight samples of English from books, papers etc., pasted and underlined.]</p>
<p>Pictorial derivations of certain English words: "Cereal" (picture of Ceres)</p> <p>"iridescent" (picture of Iris).</p>	<p>Why not learn the root word and save time?</p> <p>[Drawing of a tree, whose branches are labeled with the English derivatives of <i>video</i> which is written at the bottom of the tree.]</p>	<p>Our English Dictionary.</p> <p>[An open book with $\frac{1}{4}$ of each page colored red to indicate the percentage of words of classical origin.]</p>

¹ Sheets of gray or white bristol board have been used in most cases. The printing is large and conspicuous, and has been done by the aid of rubber stamps.

III. Latin makes it easier to learn Italian, French, and Spanish.

Latin has never been a
"dead" language.

[A map of the Roman
Empire showing the extent of
popular Latin at one time.
It is now called English,
French, Italian, and Spanish.]

This Italian newspaper
shows how much Latin there
is in the Italian language.

[A recent Italian paper
with the words of Latin origin
underlined in green.]

This French newspaper
shows the extent to which
French is indebted to Latin.

[A recent French paper
with the words of Latin origin
underlined in red.]

A Latin student can read
these Spanish advertisements.

[Advertisements from a
Spanish newspaper with Latin
vocabulary attached.]

The black in these circles
indicates the percentage of
words a Latin student does
not need to look up.

[Circles giving the per-
centage of Latin in English,
Italian, French, and Span-
ish.]

Latin Syntax in Italian.

Dative with *placet*:
Latin: *mihi placet*
Italian: *mi piace*

The results of the Exhibit have more than justified the immense labor involved in its making. While it has probably not made any student like Latin who disliked it before, since, as Whitman well knew, "Sermons and logic never convince," it has had the desired effect of making the thoughtless boy or girl pause before saying, "Latin is all foolishness; it doesn't do you any good." He is very likely to say, on the other hand, if he has any claim to reasonableness, that he has never realized before how large a part Latin played in his world. The following quotation from a recent Freshman test paper on the subject is characteristic of the situation with many pupils:

I used to think that Latin didn't help you any, but I have changed.

Recent Books

Foreign books in this list may be obtained of Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 West 27th St., New York City; G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-55 West 25th St., New York City.

- BEVAN, EDWARD. *Aeschylus, Seven against Thebes*. An English verse translation. London: Arnold, 1912. Pp. 96. 2s.
- CHADWICK, H. M. *The Heroic Age*. A comparative study of Teutonic and Greek heroic poetry and traditions. Cambridge University Press, 1912. Pp. 474. 12s.
- CUMONT, F. V. M. *Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans*. New York: Putnam, 1912. Pp. XXVII+208. \$1.50.
- EARLE, MORTIMER LAMSON. *The Classical Papers of Mortimer Lamson Earle, with a Memoir*. New York: Lemcke & Buechner, 1912. Pp. xxix+298. \$3.00.
- ENGEL, E. *Der Wohnsitz des Odysseus Ithaka oder Leukas?* Leipzig: Brandstetter, 1912. Pp. 45. M. 1.
- FARNELL, L. R. *The Higher Aspects of Greek Religion*. (Hibbert Lectures, 2d series.) London: Williams & Norgate, 1912. Pp. 155. 6s.
- GURLITT, L. *Anschaungstafeln zu Caesar. Milites legionarii*. 61×91 cm. Gotha: Perthes, 1912. M. 4.
- HARRISON, JANE E. *Themis*. A study of the social origins of Greek Religion. Cambridge University Press, 1912. Pp. xxii+559. 15s.
- KROMAYER, J., und VEITH, G. *Antike Schlachtfelder*. III. Band, Italien und Afrika. 1. Abteilung: *Italien*, von J. KROMAYER. Berlin: Weidmann, 1912. Pp. xv+494.
- KÜHNER, R. *Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache*. 2. Aufl., I. Band. *Elementar-, Formen-, u. Wortlehre*. Neubearb. v. FRDR. HOLZWEISSIG. Hannover: Halm, 1912. Pp. xvi+1127. M. 24.
- LIPSIUS, J. H. *Das attische Recht u. Rechtsverfahren*. II. Band. 2. Hälfte. Leipzig: Reisland, 1912. Pp. viii+322. M. 8.
- MITCHELL, B. W. *Elements of Latin*. New York: Hinds, Noble & Eldredge, 1912. Pp. vii+303. \$1.00.
- MITTEIS, L. und WILCKEN, U. *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*. I. Band: Historischer Teil. 1. Hälfte: Grundzüge. Pp. lxxii+437. M. 12. 2. Hälfte: Chrestomathie. Pp. viii+579. M. 14. II. Band: Juristischer Teil. 1. Hälfte: Grundzüge. Pp. xviii+298. M. 8. 2. Hälfte: Chrestomathie: Pp. vi+430. M. 12. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912.
- POHLENZ, MAX. *Ciceronis Tusculanarum disputationum libri v*. I. Heft: Libri i et ii. Leipzig: Teubner, 1912. Pp. iv+180. M. 2.30.
- WOLFF, C. L. *The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction*. (Columbia University Studies in Comparative Literature.) New York: Lemcke & Buechner, 1912. Pp. ix+529. \$2.00.
- ZIEMANN, F. *De epistularum Graecarum formulis sollemnibus quaestiones selectae*. Diss. philol. Hal., Vol. XVIII, fasc. 4. Halle: Niemeyer, 1911. Pp. vi+119.